

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

INTELLECT WIRELESS, INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 08-C-1215
)	
v.)	Honorable Joan B. Gottschall
)	Magistrate Judge Susan E. Cox
)	
T-MOBILE USA, INC., UNITED)	
STATES CELLULAR CORP.,)	
VIRGIN MOBILE USA, L.P., HELIO,)	JURY DEMAND
INC.)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO
HELIO, INC.'S ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS**

Plaintiff Intellect Wireless, Inc. ("Intellect Wireless") hereby responds to Helio, Inc.'s ("Helio") Counterclaims, served on April 24, 2008, as follows:

40. Helio, Inc. ("Helio") is a Delaware corporation with corporate headquarters at 10960 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 700, Los Angeles, California 90024.

Response:

Admitted.

41. Upon information and belief, Intellect Wireless, Inc. ("Intellect Wireless") is a Texas corporation and has a principal place of business in Forth Worth, Texas.

Response:

Admitted that Intellect Wireless is a Texas corporation with an office in Fort Worth, Texas; otherwise denied.

42. These counterclaims arise under federal law, and this Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, 2201, and 2202, and the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*

Response:

Admitted that this Court has jurisdiction; otherwise denied.

43. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 and 1400(b).

Response:

Admitted.

44. Intellect Wireless has asserted that Helio infringes U.S. Patent Nos. 7,257,210, 7,266,186, and 7,305,076 (collectively "the patents in suit"). An actual controversy exists between Helio and Intellect Wireless over the alleged infringement, invalidity, and unenforceability of those patents-in-suit.

Response:

Admitted that Helio infringes the patents in suit; otherwise denied.

FIRST COUNTERCLAIM

45. Helio incorporates and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 44 as though fully set forth herein.

Response:

Intellect Wireless incorporates and realleges its responses to paragraphs 40-44 as though set forth herein; no response is necessary to paragraphs 1-39 of Helio's answer and affirmative defenses.

46. Helio has not infringed and does not directly or indirectly infringe any valid, enforceable claim of the patents in suit, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

Response:

Denied.

SECOND COUNTERCLAIM

47. Helio incorporates and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 46 as though fully set forth herein.

Response:

Intellect Wireless incorporates and realleges its responses to paragraphs 40-46 as though set forth herein; no response is necessary to paragraphs 1-39 of Helio's answer and affirmative defenses.

48. The patents in suit are invalid for failing to satisfy one or more of the requirements of the Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.*, including, but not limited to, the conditions of patentability set forth in 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112.

Response:

Denied.

ADDITIONAL DEFENSES

1. Helio's pleading fails to state claims upon which relief can be granted, i.e., claims for noninfringement and invalidity of the patents in suit.
2. Helio's pleading fails to state a justiciable controversy on any issue of noninfringement or invalidity.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Intellect Wireless requests judgment in its favor on Helio's Counterclaims, including declaratory judgment that the patents in suit are not infringed and not invalid, an award of its costs, fees and expenses as provided by law, and any other and further relief to which Intellect Wireless may be entitled or the Court or a jury may award.

JURY DEMAND

Intellect Wireless hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ David J. Mahalek

Paul K. Vickrey

Paul C. Gibbons

David J. Mahalek

NIRO, SCAVONE, HALLER & NIRO

181 West Madison Street, Suite 4600

Chicago, IL 60602

(312) 236-0733

Fax: (312) 236-3137

***Attorneys for Plaintiff,
Intellect Wireless, Inc.***

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing **PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO HELIO, INC.'S COUNTERCLAIMS** was electronically filed with the Clerk of Court using CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following e-mail addresses on May 7, 2008 by:

Thomas L. Duston (tduston@marshallip.com)
Margaret Lynn Begalle (mbegalle@marshallip.com)
Marshall, Gerstein & Borun
233 South Wacker Drive
6300 Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 474-6300
Fax: (312) 474-0448

Josh A. Krevitt (jkrevitt@gibsondunn.com)
Charles J. Boudreau (cboundrea@gibsondunn.com)
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
(212) 351-4000
Fax: (212) 351-4035
Attorneys for T-Mobile USA, Inc. and Helio, Inc.

Richard J. O'Brien (robrien@sidley.com)
Nabeel Khan (nkhan@sidley.com)
Sidley Austin LLP
One South Dearborn Street
Chicago, IL 60603
(312) 853-7000
Fax: (312) 853-7036
Attorneys for United States Cellular Corporation

Christina M. Tchen (tina.tchen@skadden.com)
Michael N. Turnage Young
(michael.turnage.young@skadden.com)
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom, LLP
333 West Wacker Drive, Suite 2100
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 407-0700/Fax: (312) 407-0411
Attorneys for Virgin Mobile USA, L.P.

/s/ David J. Mahalek